

REMARKS

The objection to the drawings put forth in the office action has been addressed by amending the specification to include the numeral 14 as suggested by the Examiner.

Regarding the provisional double patenting rejection which is based on Perry, we note that the Perry application was filed one year after the instant application was filed. We also note that no office actions have been issued relating to the Perry application, which was filed by the undersigned. That being the case, any patent(s) issuing from this application will expire before any patent(s) that would issue from the Perry application, therefore, it seems that a terminal disclaimer is not necessary in this application, but would be appropriate in the Perry application. We would certainly be amenable to filing a terminal disclaimer in the Perry application if asked to do so. Thus, we respectfully traverse the provisional double patenting rejection in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Jones

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 24,607

6 Juniper Lane

Madison, CT 06443

(203) 245-2418

Date 6-7-06